

# MINORITY OPINIONS

**The comments concerning this handbook presented below are included at the request of the representative of the American Iron and Steel Institute.**

- Concerning Chapter 1, Sec. 1.4:

It is questioned if rehabilitation techniques need to be fully consistent with the *NEHRP Recommended Provisions* for new buildings. The *NEHRP Recommended Provisions* were developed with modern buildings as the underlying basis. Force fitting detailing provisions developed for modern structures onto older structures may overlook adequate details built into many older buildings which can provide adequate toughness.

- Concerning Chapter 3, Sec. 3.0.4:

In the 5th line of the first paragraph the word "tested" should be changed. A test implies that a structural system has been subjected to known loading conditions which is typically not the case with existing buildings.

- Concerning Chapter 3, Sec. 3.1:

We strongly object to the organization of this section. Typically when several subjects are presented the most significant is placed first. Since we are dealing with techniques of rehabilitating seismically deficient structures this section should be organized with the most significant (deficient) structures first. The scope of the section should then explain the reason for the organization of the section. For whatever reason this section has been organized with steel moment frames placed first. Steel moment frames have been observed to be one of the most reliable seismic resisting systems worldwide, the majority of which were not designed to modern seismic detailing practices.

- Concerning Chapter 4, Sec. 4.1:

Additional techniques such as reducing the weight by eliminating hollow clay tile partitions and substituting with lightweight partitions should be included.

- Concerning Appendix C:

Where a limited number of examples are to be presented they should be based upon the highest risk structural systems. Certainly steel moment frames do not fall into that category. The two most common types of seismically deficient structural systems observed in past earthquakes are unreinforced masonry and poorly detailed concrete frames. The inclusion of steel moment frames as one of two examples does not serve justice to the potential risk of the various structural systems.

**The comments concerning this handbook presented below are included at the request of the representative of the American Institute of Steel Construction:**

- Concerning Chapter 3:

In Sec. 3.1.1.1, modify the first sentence to read: "The principal deficiencies of ordinary steel moment frames in high seismic areas are:"

In Sec. 3.3.1.1, modify the first sentence to read: "The principal deficiencies of steel concentrically braced frames in high seismic areas are:"

Users of this document may not read the Introduction and/or Sec. 3.0.4 for a proper orientation on seismic zonation. Thus, explicit reminders in the actual design chapters are needed.

# **BUILDING SEISMIC SAFETY COUNCIL BOARD OF DIRECTION -- 1992**

<b>Chairman</b>	Gerald H. Jones, Director of Codes Administration, Kansas City, Missouri
<b>Vice Chairman</b>	Allan Porush, Dames and Moore, Los Angeles, California (representing Structural Engineers Association of California)
<b>Secretary</b>	Harry W. Martin, American Iron and Steel Institute, Newcastle, California
<b>Ex-Officio</b>	Warner Howe, Gardner and Howe, Memphis, Tennessee
<b>Members</b>	<p>John C. Canestro, PE, City of Orinda, Pleasanton, California (representing the National Institute of Building Sciences)</p> <p>S. K. Ghosh, Portland Cement Association, Skokie, Illinois</p> <p>Mark B. Hogan, National Concrete Masonry Association, Herndon, Virginia</p> <p>Nestor Iwankiw, American Institute of Steel Construction, Chicago, Illinois</p> <p>H. S. "Pete" Kellam, Graham and Kellam, San Francisco, California (representing the American Society of Civil Engineers)</p> <p>Les Murphy, International Association of Fire Fighters, (representing AFL/CIO Building and Construction Trades Department)</p> <p>F. Robert Preece, Preece/Goudie &amp; Associates, San Francisco, California, (representing Earthquake Engineering Research Institute)</p> <p>Blair Tulloch, Tulloch Construction, Inc., Oakland, California (representing the Associated General Contractors of America)</p> <p>David Tyree, National Forest Products Association, Georgetown, California</p> <p>Martin Walsh, City of St. Louis, Missouri (representing the Building Officials and Code Administrators International)</p> <p>Richard Wright, National Institute of Standards and Technology, Gaithersburg, Maryland (representing the Interagency Committee for Seismic Safety in Construction)</p>
<b>Staff</b>	<p>James R. Smith, Executive Director</p> <p>O. Allen Israelsen, Project Manager</p> <p>Claret M. Heider, Technical Writer-Editor</p> <p>Karen E. Smith, Administrative Assistant</p>